



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,442	03/17/2004	Gregory E. Aldridge	8233-12	3526
30565 7590 02/22/2007 WOODARD, EMHARDT, MORIARTY, MCNETT & HENRY LLP 111 MONUMENT CIRCLE, SUITE 3700 INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204-5137			EXAMINER LEWIS, CHERYL RENE A	
			ART UNIT 2167	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS			02/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/802,442

Applicant(s)

ALDRIDGE, GREGORY E.

Examiner

Cheryl Lewis

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the applicants' remarks received on November 27, 2006.
2. Claims 1-38 are presented for examination.
3. The applicants have not amended any claims.
4. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1-38 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Response to Arguments

5a. The applicants' arguments recite the following:

"Regarding Claims 1 and 17, Applicants respectfully submit that Fuchs does not anticipate or make obvious all of the elements of the current claims. For example, one claim element of independent claims 1 and 17 requires *"mapping a plurality of data elements from the data source to a multidimensional cube."*" page 2, paragraph 2 (rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103)

a1. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicants' arguments. Fuchs does teach the claim limitation for *"mapping a plurality of data elements from the data source to a multidimensional cube"* as recited by independent claims 1 and 17. Fuchs teaches mapping a plurality of data elements which are elements found in a timesheet page application, element 400. These elements of the timesheet page application are predefined elements, these elements comprise employee number (element 305), employee name (element 815), work date (element 320), etc. (paragraph 0061)

The timesheet page application is stored on web server, element 102, and can be downloaded by the web server (element 102) and provided to computing device, element 101 (paragraph 0058). The web server is the "data source" from which the predefined data elements are being mapped from. The web server is the data source that is mapping a plurality of predefined data elements of the timesheet page application to computing device 101. Computing device 101 is the multidimensional cube to which the data source, web server, is being mapped from.

According, to the applicants' specification, the multidimensional cube has to be generated and built based on user specifics. A user has to generate a cube structure by focusing on at least one dimension at a time. After, the multi-dimensional cube is built, then the cube is transformed into recordsets. Thus, it is the opinion of the examiner that the predefined data elements of the timesheet application do not become a multidimensional cube until the user of computing device 101 builds and generates the timesheet application. The user of computing device 101 builds and generates the timesheet application by providing data for the predefined data elements of the timesheet application (paragraph 0061). The user provides and enters data for the data fields of the timesheet via a graphical user interface. Once the data has been provided for the data field (employee name (610), ssn (615), start date (630), etc.) of the timesheet, then the user has successfully generated and built the "*multi-dimensional cube*" which becomes a timesheet record comprising a plurality of elements that are descriptive of different types of work information. Thus, it is the opinion of

Regarding the claim limitations of independent claims 1 and 17 requiring *"mapping a plurality of data elements from the data source to a multi-dimensional cube"*, these claim limitations are extremely broad. The applicants have not provided any specific, descriptive, and/or detailed information about the type of data elements, data source, and multi-dimensional cube that is required to perform the steps of mapping from the data source to a multi-dimensional cube. Perhaps, the applicants should kindly consider amending the claim language of (1) data elements, (2) data source, and (3) multi-dimensional cube to recite *"wherein"* these particular elements comprise a specific, descriptive, and detailed data information and/or information attribute(s).

b. The applicants' arguments recite the following:

"Fuchs describes a "timesheet reporting and extraction system" that includes functionality for processing worker schedules and timesheets directly input by administrators and workers respectively using interactive forms." (paragraph 3, rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103)

b1. In paragraph 3, page 2 of the applicants' arguments, the applicants have presented a summary of the Fuchs prior art.

c. The applicants' arguments recite the following:

"Assuming that the "timesheet information" of Fuchs is indeed an identified data source as required by the claim, Fuchs fails to disclose..."

"In no way does the form map data obtained from "timesheet information" to a multi-dimensional cube."
(paragraph 2, page 3)

c1. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicants' arguments. The limitations of these claims have been addressed in paragraph a1 above. Again, Fuch teaches data, timesheet application, element 400, is mapped from the data source, web server,

element 102 to computing device, 101, which generates and builds the multi-dimensional cube.

d. The applicants' arguments recite the following:

“In contrast, the claim requires mapping data elements into dimensions, levels, and measures in order to create a multi-dimensional cube which captures the relationships in the data. Further, a multi-dimensional cube, as required by the claim, is arranged so that every data is...”
(page 3, paragraph 3)

d1. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's arguments. Fuchs teaches the timesheet application contains data elements that forms dimensions, levels, and measures in order to create a multi-dimensional cube which captures the relationships in the data. Figure 7 illustrates a schedule setup page (element 700) that indicates that a "new schedule" has been created (see figure 7 and paragraph 0086). This newly created schedule setup indicates several data elements including schedule (element 710), description (element 715), and duration (element 720) that forms dimensions and levels indicated by a time in/out standard (element 725), a worked hours field (element 730), and a recompensable hours field (element 735). For instance, the dimensions and levels of a time in/out standard (element 735) may specify the preferred or required daily start and stop times for an employee bound to follow the schedule. Two pairs of in/out time standards 725 are provided and the pair is broken by a meal break. Likewise, the worked hours field 730 may specify the daily number of hours expected to work. The dimension and level of elements 725, 730, and 735 are depicted in figure 7 as "week 1" having individual days of the week beginning with Sunday and ending with Saturday as page identifiers. Each of these identifiers

and a β -factor (element 7, 0.0001).

Art Unit: 2167

(workdays, Sunday thru Saturday) individually comprise separate levels and/or sub-fields that indicate a "time in" and a "time out" field (element 725), a number of hours worked field (element 730), and a recompensable hours field (element 735). Therefore, each identifier (Sunday thru Saturday) individually comprises 3 separate specific data fields that relate to each day of the workweek. Each day of the work week comprises a value to indicate the number of hours an employee spent working, a value to indicate the total for the number of hours work for that particular day, etc. The schedule setup is arranged according to the days of the week, Sunday thru Saturday, having a plurality of field identifiers that are assigned a value to specifically relate the data elements to members of the multi-dimensional cube.

e. The applicants' arguments recite the following:

"However, the Examiner fails to address the additional specific requirements of claim 17. For example, claim 17 requires, during the mapping of the data elements, the creation of at least one dimension, one level for each dimension, and a first set of values for at least one level."

e1. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicants' arguments. The limitations that the applicants' refer to as not being addressed in the office action dated August 8, 2006 regarding *"during the mapping of the data elements, the creation of at least one dimension, one level for each dimension, and a first set of values for at least one level"*, has in fact been addressed in the examiner's office action. On page 4 of the examiner's office action, paragraph 14, claim 10 comprises the claimed limitations that the applicants' arguments state that were not addressed. It appears that independent claim 17 is a combination of both independent claim 1 and dependent claim 10. Fuchs teaches "mapping of the data elements". The limitations of these claims and the

Art Unit: 2167

examiner's arguments supporting the teaches of Fuchs regarding "mapping of the data elements" has been addressed in the remarks presented above, paragraph a1. Fuchs teaches the creation of at least one dimension. This claim limitation has also been addressed in the examiner's arguments in paragraphs a1 and d1 presented above.

Figure 7 of the prior art teaches "creating" a new schedule setup for the workweek. The schedule comprises dimensions schedule (element 710), description (element 715), and duration (element 720). These dimensions have identifiers, days of the week (Sunday thru Saturday), that each individually contain values. The values for these identifiers are indicated in each sub-field of the work day to indicate the amount of hours spent for a total duration at work each day, a number to indicate when an employee arrived at work for a "time/in" and a number to indicate when an employee leaves work indicated by a "time/out", etc.

Therefore, it is the opinion of the examiner that every claimed element presented in the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 1 and 17 has been met by the Fuchs prior art. Actually, it is the applicants who have failed to argue the specifics of the claim limitations regarding *"mapping a plurality of data elements from the data source to a multi-dimensional cube."* The examiner has given the broadest interpretation of the claim limitations, as a result the examiner has rejected claims 1-38 under 35 U.S.C. 103. The applicants have stated that "the multi-dimensional cube of the present invention must satisfy broader data analysis techniques, such as readily viewing data by dimensions, such as by product, time-period (emphasis added), or type of venue to name just a few examples." However, the Fuchs prior art teaches by example the

Art Unit: 2167

applicants' intended use for a multi-dimensional cube having a data analysis that is readily viewed by a time-period. Again, if it is the applicants' intention to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection, then the applicants should specifically state what these claim limitations are and what is the functionality of these claims. The applicants have presented arguments stating that Fuchs does not teach any of the claim limitations regarding *"mapping a plurality of data elements from the data source to a multi-dimensional cube"*, but the applicants have not specifically recited in their arguments and in the claim limitations that *"wherein"* claim limitation (1) *"mapping a plurality of data elements"*, (2) *"from the data source"*, and (3) *"to a multi-dimensional cube"* comprise and specifically define particular data attributes having particular data functionality. It is noted that the features upon which applicants relies (*"mapping a plurality of data elements from the data source to a multi-dimensional cube"*) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The remaining claims (2-16 and 18-38) comprise dependent claims, these claims are also rejected for being dependent upon independent claims 1 and 17. These claims are also rejected for at least the reasons presented above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

known in the art at the time of the invention.

Art Unit: 2167

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuchs et al. (Publication No.: US 2004/0019542 A1 filed July 26, 2002, hereinafter Fuchs) and Snyder et al. (Publication No.: US 2004/0027368 A1 filed May 8, 2003, hereinafter Snyder).

8. Regarding Claims 1 and 17, Fuchs teaches a timesheet reporting and extraction system and method.

The method and associated system for a timesheet reporting and extraction system as taught or suggested by Fuchs includes:

identifying a data source (paragraph 0058, web server, element 102); mapping a plurality of data elements (paragraph 0034, "...a timesheet reporting and extraction system (TRAX)...", timesheet page application, element 400, paragraph 0061) from the data source to a multi-dimensional cube (The user of computing device 101 builds and generates the timesheet application by providing data for the predefined data elements of the timesheet application, paragraphs 0061 and 0087); transforming the multi-dimensional cube into a test recordset to determine if the plurality of data elements are mapped correctly (paragraph 0087); saving the mapping information (paragraph 0087); generating a final recordset from the data source (paragraph 0087, 0091, 0097, and 0104);

and mapping of the data elements, creating at least one dimension, one level for each dimension, and a first set of values for at least one level (Figure 7 of the prior art

Art Unit: 2167

teaches "creating" a new schedule setup for the work week. The schedule comprises dimensions schedule (element 710), description (element 715), and duration (element 720). These dimensions have identifiers, days of the week (Sunday thru Saturday), that each individually contain values. The values for these identifiers are indicated in each sub-field of the work day to indicate the amount of hours spent for a total duration at work each day, a number to indicate when an employee arrived at work for a "time/in" and a number to indicate when an employee leaves work indicated by a "time/out", etc.)

However, Fuchs does not expressly teach a template.

Snyder teaches a template (paragraph 0083).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the timesheet method of Fuchs with the timesheet method of Snyder because Snyder's timesheet method could enable the timesheet method of Fuchs to comprise a template, wherein the template enables creating a new draft or generic time sheet (see Snyder, paragraph 0083).

9. Regarding Claim 2, Fuchs teaches the final recordset in an application (paragraph 0087, 0091, 0097, and 0104).

10. Regarding Claims 3 and 25, Fuchs teaches a digital dashboard with multiple content windows and at least part of the final recordset is displayed in one of the content windows (paragraph 0087, 0091, 0094-0099).

11. Regarding Claims 4 and 18, Fuchs teaches the data source is an HTML document (paragraph 0058).

Art Unit: 2167

12. Regarding Claims 5 and 19, Fuchs teaches the HTML document has a static layout (paragraph 0058).

13. Regarding Claims 6 and 20, Fuchs teaches the HTML document has a dynamic layout that can change (paragraph 0058).

14. Regarding Claims 7 and 21, Fuchs teaches the HTML document is a report (paragraph 0058).

15. Regarding Claims 8 and 22, Fuchs teaches the data source is a report (paragraph 0058).

16. Regarding Claim 9, Fuchs teaches specifying at least one rule that is applied to the data elements to generate the multi-dimensional cube (paragraph 0087).

17. Regarding Claim 10, Fuchs teaches creating at least one dimension (paragraph 0087, 0091, 0097); creating at least one level for each dimension (paragraph 0087, 0091, 0097). Adding a first set of values to a selected one of the one level for each dimension (paragraph 0087, 0091, 0097); creating at least one measure (paragraph 0087, 0091, 0097); and adding a second set of values to at least one measure (paragraph 0087, 0091, 0097).

18. Regarding Claims 11 and 23, Fuchs teaches at least one level is a lowest level (paragraph 0087).

19. Regarding Claim 12, Fuchs teaches the first set of values and the second set of values have at least some overlapping values (paragraph 0087).

20. Regarding Claim 13, Fuchs teaches determining a plurality of intersections in a plurality of dimension trees in the multi-dimensional cube (paragraph 0087); and

building the respective test or final recordset from the intersections (paragraph 0087, 0091, 0097).

21. Regarding Claims 14 and 24, Fuchs teaches intersections are determined by overlapping positions of the elements in the multi-dimensional cube (paragraph 0087, 0091, 0097).

22. Regarding Claim 15 Fuchs teaches a dimensional tree of the plurality of dimension trees to use as a main tree (paragraph 0087, 0091, 0097); and using the main tree as a driving force to determine the plurality of intersections (paragraph 0087, 0091, 0097).

23. Regarding Claims 16 and 26, Fuchs teaches the transforming step and generating step are the same step are preformed after the saving step (paragraph 0087, 0091, 0097, and 0104).

24. Regarding Claim 27, the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejections of claims 1 and 17 presented above. In addition, Fuchs teaches one or more servers (figure 1, element 103); one or more conversion tools (figure 1, element 108) coupled to the one or more servers over a network (figure 1, element 106); one or more client computers (figure 1, element 101) coupled to the server over a network; one or more servers contain business logic (paragraph 0036-0037); and a user interface for display (paragraph 0041).

25. Regarding Claims 28-38, the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejections of claims 1, 10, 12, 15, 17, and 27 presented above. It is therefore rejected as set forth above.

Art Unit: 2167

26. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

NAME OF CONTACT

27. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl Lewis whose telephone number is (571) 272-4113. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

(571) 273-4113 (Use this FAX #, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "DRAFT" communication. Examiners may request that a formal paper/amendment be faxed directly to them on occasions.).

Art Unit: 2167

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/ Technology Center (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Cheryl Lewis
Patent Examiner
February 20, 2007